

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,564	08/17/2005	Yasuhiro Saito	16169.4	6718
22913 WORKMAN N	7590 10/18/200 YYDEGGER	EXAMINER		
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE			GRANT, ALVIN J	
	1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	3723	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		\mathcal{A}			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/532,564	SAITO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Alvin J. Grant	3723			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available upder the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailling date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 A	ugust 2007.				
•—	s action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdrawn 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 7- is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	from consideration.				
Application Papers		·			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine					
,	cepted or b) objected to by the				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
		,			
Attachment(s)	A) 🔲 later dans Comerca	v (PTO 413)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summan Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date			

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 7-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eda et al. 6,430,965 in view of Matsuno et al. US 2003/0109202.

Referring to claims 7, 9, 10 and 16-18, Eda et al. discloses a method for manufacturing a glass substrate for an information recording medium comprising the claimed method steps except for the use of an alkaline solution for washing. Matsuno et al. teaches the use of an alkaline solution for washing a glass substrate so as to neutralize the impact of the previously used acidic solution. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have rinsed the substrate of Eda et al. with an alkaline solution as taught by Eda et al. so as to neutralize the impact of the previously used acidic solution.

Referring to claim 8, Eda et al. as modified, does not specifically disclose a depth for grinding the surface or a thickness of the substrate. Determining the thickness of the substrate is a matter of design choice since the thickness could be determined through experimentation to ascertain what would constitute a feasible thickness. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have ground the surface layer for a depth of 0.5 nm or more so that the surface layer has a thickness of 3 nm or less, since such a

Art Unit: 3723

modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change

in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re

Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Referring to claims 11-15, Eda et al. as modified, discloses the claimed invention except

that Eda et al. does not disclose the pH levels of the acid and alkaline washing liquids.

Discovering an optimum range could be determined through experimentation. It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to have used washing solutions have pH 3.0 or less; 10.5 or less and 11 to 13,

since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the

prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the

art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-15 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Alvin J. Grant whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4484. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 3723

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail can be reached on (571) 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alvin J Grant
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3723

Page 4

ajg